



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

one as by far the best thing in the book. The point of view is interesting and certainly brings to light instructive facts. In general, however, the author's treatment of the origin and growth of slave labor in our country is unsatisfactory. There is too much description of well known conditions, with only here and there an attempt to explain matters. This is especially the case with the chapter which is devoted to the treatment of the slaves by their masters and overseers. Surely the long biography of an imaginary Congo negro is out of place in a book of this kind.

Professor von Waltershausen adds a long list of authorities to his work and gives liberal excerpts therefrom, but generally to the point. In looking over the list one finds that early histories and books of travel have for the most part been relied upon, while the Colonial Records and records of the Board of Trade seem not to have been carefully examined. On the general development of the colonies later American works than those of Bancroft and Hildreth do not seem to have been consulted by the author—which is strange in the light of the recent work so admirably done in this field.

Professor von Waltershausen's book is throughout interesting and instructive in style, as well as in plan and method. Works on American economic history are, one might almost say, crying needs. Professor von Waltershausen has set us an admirable example. His latest book should inspire us to continue the work along these lines.

LINDLEY M. KEASBEY.

BYRN MAWR COLLEGE.

Geschichte des Antiken Kommunismus und Socialismus. Von DR. ROBERT PÖHLMANN. Vol. I. Munich, C. H. Beck, 1893.—xvii, 618 pp.

The importance which the discussion of socialism has attained is suggested by the appearance of such a work as this, which devotes a volume of more than 600 pages to the discussion of Greek socialism alone. What the scope of the completed work is to be we are not told; if carried out on the present scale, it will apparently be the most important work in existence on the subject.

Like all such undertakings, the present work has its disadvantages. It is exhausting as well as exhaustive, and the laboriousness of the writer's style is unrelieved by even the faintest literary instinct. But form, proportion, elegance, are so generally lacking in such German publications that we are more surprised by their presence

than by their absence. It is no small tribute to the substantial value of books like this that we are compelled so quickly to forget their defects.

Without defining his terms, the author seems to use "communism" to designate socialism in practice, the term socialism being restricted to theoretical or philosophical proposals. Under the former head are considered primitive communism, the communism of the Homeric epoch, and the communistic states of Lipara, Magna Græcia, Sparta and Crete. The view presented is decidedly at variance with that ordinarily held. While the earliest social organization is undoubtedly communistic, a careful examination of the Homeric poems presents indisputable proof that this primitive organization had been long outgrown and that the institution of private property had attained a paramount importance in the social economy of the period. Even the customs which suggest the earlier economy are shown to be survivals whose significance is often lost. The argument is sometimes controversial in tone, but it could hardly be more convincing.

But if the early communism had died out before the days of Homer, what shall be said of the theory that the communistic states of Lipara, Crete and Sparta were survivals of this earlier economy? How are such survivals to be explained in the midst of civilizations so conspicuously individualistic? How did one part of Hellas get the start of another part by so many centuries? Above all, how did the older economy "survive" in colonies sent out by states that had abandoned that economy? Dr. Pöhlmann's answer is that this later communism was in no way like the earlier. In its most essential traits, as in the land system of Sparta, it shows its artificial character, — a character sufficiently accounted for, moreover, by the military organization and function of these states. There is no more admirable chapter in the book than that on the "Social State of the Legends and the Socialistic Natural Right." The history of Sparta, the author points out, first took definite form in the hands of social reformers who wished to arrest the decay of the state and the insidious encroachments of the surrounding wealth-worship. The period was as fruitful in social theories as the eighteenth century. Plato, Aristotle and Isocrates had filled the minds of men with communistic ideals of a perfect state. The historical temper was unknown. To the reforming zeal of the day what was more natural than that these ideals should be all unconsciously read back into the history of Sparta, thus giving to the cause of reform the support of tradition and the authority of the mighty Lycurgus? This not only might but

must have happened. It necessarily follows, according to Dr. Pöhlmann, that all arguments drawn from the Lysurgus tradition are untrustworthy, and he then proceeds with masterly skill to winnow them of their chaff.

Athens has often been cited as furnishing examples of a partially socialistic economy, but our author implies his disapproval of such an analysis. Athens was "atomistic-individualistic," illustrating the tendency of unbalanced individualism to destroy all social cohesion, to develop destructive egoism and transform the noble art of government into a scramble of individuals over the spoils of public plunder. The parcelling out of public resources among individuals was not socialism, but individualism gone mad.

How desperate the prospects of an individualistic organization of society must have seemed in the light of Athenian experience, is indicated by the fact that two thinkers so radically different as Plato and Aristotle should have joined in the most unqualified attack upon it that has ever appeared in human literature. The most of Dr. Pöhlmann's large volume is devoted to a consideration of their social philosophy. Here again the accepted interpretations, after being acutely analyzed, are pronounced unsatisfactory. It seems incredible that anything so long known and discussed as Plato's *Republic* should be the subject of fundamental misconception, but it is difficult to resist this conclusion.

The features of Plato's scheme — the rule of reason and virtue, the community of goods and wives, the equality of the sexes and the detailed autocratic socialism of the whole — are familiar. The prevailing criticism, as represented by Zeller, is almost as well known. It charges Plato, first, with inconsistency, in that he leaves undeveloped the whole industrial régime of the state while going into the utmost detail regarding the training and choice of state functionaries. The inference is either that he was unable to conceive of a socialistic régime beyond the point of "glittering generalities," or that he intended to leave the industrial portion of the community in unregulated individualism, caring only for the development of the ruling *élite*. The superficiality of these conclusions is proved by the simplest reference to Plato's own statement. He fortunately tells why he neglected the details of industrial organization. While believing that they should be under the absolute control and minute supervision of the state, he does not believe in any theory of their management which would hamper those to whom the duty of management is entrusted. In other words, Plato does not believe in a constitu-

tional government. The safeguard of the state lies in the character of its rulers, and these, once chosen with all possible precautions, are not to be hampered in the exercise of that higher wisdom, the proud possession of which determined their choice.

The further claim that Plato sacrificed the individual to the state is equally unfounded. He *subordinated* the individual to the state, but only in the conviction that so he would attain his highest *individual interest*. Statements on this point abound.

Finally, we are told that Plato sacrificed the many to the few. This allegation is made both by way of censure and by way of praise, according to the bias of the critics. They are divided, like the society of which they are a part, into two schools, the aristocratic and the democratic. The one seeks the *intensive* development of humanity, but its gains are insignificant because confined to an insignificant minority. The other seeks the *extensive* development of humanity, but fails of its end for lack of differentiation. The infinitesimal progress of an infinite number is of doubtful significance. Plato, first among social philosophers, appreciated the importance of division of labor, and carried the idea into every department of social life. For him to sympathize with a leveling democracy was impossible. But if he believed in specializing the better few for the higher functions, no man more than he avoided the egoism of aristocracy. It is one thing to set aside the few for the sake of humanity; it is another thing to set aside humanity for the sake of the few.

Full of his "divine inspiration" Plato embarked for Syracuse at the invitation of its young ruler, whose interest in the ideal state seemed to promise much for its realization. We hardly need the vague tradition to tell us the inevitable result. It was with less confidence in the beneficence of absolute power and a keener sense of the inertia of human nature, that Plato in later years again tried to solve the problem of social organization. In *The Laws* we see the same Plato with the same ideals and the same temper, but his reliance is otherwise placed. The election of officers shows his distrust of kings, while the intricate system of indirect election shows his old distrust of democracy. But this state has a constitution. Rulers cannot be trusted to preserve the ideals of the state. The isolation of this new state, the prohibition of commerce and the amazing restrictions upon freedom of speech and of belief reveal the larger sense of difficulty born of experience. We are glad Plato had no second opportunity to experiment. He was a vehicle of

"divine inspiration," but not a practical manager of men. The monstrous evils of an untamed individualism could not escape his notice, but while sound in all his instincts toward life, he was not a reformer or a statesman.

The practical temper of Aristotle prepares us for a very different proposal. But while showing a strong inclination to criticise his master, not always with fairness, he is in substantial agreement with the latter's later scheme. He puts a greater emphasis than did Plato upon the individualistic side of this social organization and doubtless had a keener sense of its importance, but his conception of the state and its functions is not less socialistic than Plato's.

Dr. Pöhlmann's summary and analysis of these great productions leaves little to be desired in comprehensiveness, thoroughness and fairness. The book can hardly be ignored by future students of the subject.

H. H. POWERS.

SMITH COLLEGE,
NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

National Life and Character: a Forecast. By CHARLES H. PEARSON. New York, Macmillan & Co., 1893.—357 pp.

Mr. Pearson was a scholar of high attainments and a man of the world, who had seen and participated in the most important developments of British imperial policy. He was also a student who displayed in history and politics powers of observation that are usually predestined to the service of natural science. His intellectual courage, too, was perfect. Discovering traits of national character that most of us fail to see, or refuse to look at, he observed them minutely and described them calmly. Reasoning upon them with great ability, he believed that they are working themselves out in tendencies that must profoundly affect the future of the white races. He concluded that we are approaching the stationary order in society and the old age of humanity. His book is painfully depressing unless one can react vigorously against its argument. By way of preparation for it one ought to ascend Mount Ararat with Dr. Bryce, or at least climb the Matterhorn with Dr. Parkhurst.

The premises of Mr. Pearson's melancholy judgments are elaborated in an original and fascinating chapter on "The Unchangeable Limits of the Higher Races." Hitherto the white races have been progressive and buoyant because they have had unlimited room for expansion. But the temperate zone is filling up. We shall not discover